Amendments to the Specification

1. Please amend the second paragraph on page 7 of the specification, beginning on line 8 and ending on line 20, as follows:

In the depicted example, an electronic scanner or scantron **13** or data receiver for electronic data [[**13**]] and database **16** are connected to network **12**. The scanner **13** is a hardware device with embedded software applications which provide electronic interpretation and recordation of information from various paper sources such as survey cards or "bubble" sheets as commonly known in the art or is a program that receives, parses and interprets electronically distributed data. Scanner **13** may be located on a corporate server **14**, personal computer or be a third party service providing data interpretation and recordation services to clients **15** and **18** ~~14, 15, 18~~. Clients **15** and **18** ~~**14, 15, 18**~~ may be, for example, personal computers, network computers, servers, wireless phones or personal digital assistant devices with access to public and private networks with one or more than one individual client. For purposes of this application, a network computer is any computer coupled to the network **12**. Distributed data processing system **10** may also include additional servers, clients, and other devices not shown. The invention may be easily implemented by one of ordinary skill in the art using known programming techniques and equipment.

2. Please amend the third paragraph on page 8 of the specification, beginning on line 13 and ending on line 22, as follows:

Initially, survey data or "scores" are collected and matriculated into an electronic database utilizing, in this embodiment, the distributed data processing system **10** as shown in **Figure 1**. In this example, the survey scores are collected from different hotels, Hotel 1 and Hotel 2, using different survey scales (**Step 22**). In common practice and for the purposes of illustration herein, Hotel 1 uses a seven-point response scale and Hotel 2 uses a ten-point response scale. The collected survey scores are then converted to score percentages, with the lowest survey scores (the "1s") receiving a value of zero percent, and the highest survey scores, seven out of seven or ten out of ten, receiving a value of 100%. **Figure 2** provides a table reflecting such values (**~~Step~~ 24**). The score percentages that are in between these values on the converted scale are assigned to the preselected values as set forth in Table 1 and 2 discussed below and shown in **Figure 2**.

3. Please amend the "Summary of the Invention" paragraph on page 5 of the specification as follows:

The present invention discloses a method for converting two different score distributions into a single, normalized distribution which provides a mechanism by which ~~different~~ surveys conducted utilizing [[on]] different scoring scales may be compared to each other on a common scale. The method consists of converting the scores of each survey to a percentage, and assigning each resultant percentage a predetermined value on the common scale, where the assignment compensates for the differences in the original disparate scale response distributions. Next, a resampling methodology is used to create a common scale distribution, which is normal

and enables the statistical comparison of scores. Each individual hospitality entity's survey score(s) from the relevant market is combined into a single, pooled data set, and the data set is standardized so that each hospitality entities' scores have the same weight. It is necessary that each score have the same weight to mitigate any influence on the sampling distribution of the mean caused by some hotels taking a larger sampling than others. From this data set, multiple sample means are calculated using a resampling methodology and a distribution of the means is formed. Under normal distribution theory, the resulting sampling distribution of the mean will be normally distributed. The standard error of the mean, which is the standard deviation of the sampling distribution of the means, is then used to evaluate the degree of difference between scores to provide an accurate test that enables statistical performance comparison among different hospitality providers. This comparison data may be utilized by the hospitality providers to manage the provision of services.

4. Please amend the paragraph on page 9 of the specification, beginning on line 5 and ending on line 21, as follows:

[[The]] Referring to **Table 1**, the four underlined scores on the seven point scale match in percent score value with the respective underlined ten point scale score. ~~four underlined score percentages on the seven and ten point scales match in value. The average of each pair of the underlined ten-point scale score values equals the corresponding underlined seven-point scale score percentage values.~~ If the average of the score percentage values for the responses of 2-3, 5-6, and 8-9 on the 10-point scale (the "adjoining score pairs") is taken, the resulting quotient results in the production of a set of scores that exactly match the score percentages for the seven point scale. This averaged value is assigned to both the numbers on the seven- and ten-point

scales. This conversion results in the translation of one set of scores into the other, and the conversion of adjoining score pairs of values on the 10-point scale into one value on the seven-point scale increases the correspondence in the variability of the resulting scores. That is, the process makes the resulting shapes of the 7- and 10-point response distributions more closely match each other ~~better~~. However, if the quantity of one score of a particular adjoining score pair is significantly larger than the other (related) score, then the difference between the assigned mean value and the actual mean value of the scores will differ. This difference between the assigned and actual means is directly proportional to the difference in quantity between the scores of the particular adjoining score pair. This may be viewed as a bias introduced into the calculation by the difference in quantity. ~~The only bias introduced by this conversion is that the more unequal the numbers of twos and threes, or fives and sixes, or eights and nines, the greater the difference between the assigned mean value and the actual mean value of the scores.~~ However, this bias has an advantage, as seen in **Table 1**. Most of the zero frequencies occur at 2 or 3, and by adding these cells together on the 10-point scale, the analysis proceeds to a very standard "collapsing across empty cells" approach to extrapolating missing data. **Table 2** provides a listing of the preselected conversion values resulting from the score conversion process for the exemplary embodiment.

5. Please delete the graph marked as "Table 3" on page 11. This graph has been relocated to the drawings as Figure 3.

6. Please amend the paragraph on page 11, beginning on line 8 and ending on line 13, as follows:

To compare converted scores from different hotels requires a common distribution. For example, consider the two smoothed frequency distributions of two different hotel scores shown by the graph in **Figure 3** ~~in **Table 3**~~. One distribution is of percentage scores from a hotel using a seven-point scale **(302)** and the other is the percentage scores collected from a hotel using a ten-point scale **(304)**. In both cases, the survey questions were identical (e.g. friendly staff, clean room, room service, hotel amenities), with the only difference being the scale size.

7. Please amend the paragraph on page 12, beginning on line 1 and ending on line 10, as follows:

The initial scores tallied from each different survey response scale resulted in two distinct distribution shapes as shown by the graph in **Figure 3** ~~in **Table 3**~~. The seven-point scale distribution **(302)** rises to a peak at the high-end of the scale and has scores along its entire range. The ten-point scale distribution **(304)** has zero frequencies at scores 1 and 2, and has a second inflection point at scores 6, 7, 8 that does not occur on the seven-point response scale. While the mean scores for the two distributions are essentially identical except for random fluctuation, the percentile ranks of the scores may be very different because of the differences in the shapes of their respective distributions. Further, the seven- and ten-point distributions do not correspond to any known statistical parameterization. The only statistically valid way to compare scores on the two distributions is to form a common distribution with known characteristics and usable statistical parameterization.

8. Please amend the "Brief Description of the Drawings" paragraph on page 6 as follows:

Figure 1 is a diagram of a network in which the present invention maybe implemented; [[and,]]

Figure 2 is a detailed block diagram illustrating the score conversion and comparison method disclosed herein[[.]]; and

Figure 3 is a graph depicting smoothed frequency distributions of two different hotel scores, namely a 7-point score and a 10-point score.